# LAND USE SCENARIOS COMPARISON Conformance with GP2020 Objectives

#### INTRODUCTION

This attachment provides a detailed analysis of how the Existing General Plan, the December 2002 and August 2003 Working Copy maps, and the Board Referrals Scenarios do (or do not) meet the nine GP2020 objectives.

## **EXISTING GENERAL PLAN**

- 1. **Develop an Internally Consistent General Plan**: This plan, developed during the 1970s, has never been comprehensively revised. Over the years, it has been amended many times, in some cases to correct deficiencies. It needs to be updated for compatibility with existing State laws and standards.
- 2. *Meet Growth Targets*: The plan capacity is more than 101,000 persons above the County's target population of about 661,000 persons.
- 3. *Reduce Public Costs*: This plan creates high public costs for infrastructure and services. Cost estimates for road construction alone are \$7.7 billion.
- 4. *Improve Housing Affordability*: This plan relies on large-lot development to house the County's future population, and contains inadequate amounts land planned for medium to high-density development. This plan also makes it difficult to cluster development, which reduces housing costs.
- 5. *Balance Competing Interests*: When developed to its full capacity, this plan would transfer much of the private land used for agriculture or habitat preservation to large-lot residential developments.
- 6. *Locate Growth Near Infrastructure, Services, and Jobs*: About 40 percent of the total population in 2020 would be located in remote areas outside the CWA boundary, which are poorly serviced by roads, emergency services, schools and other public services.
- 7. Assign Densities Based on Characteristics of the Land: Most physically constrained and/or environmentally sensitive areas contain a maximum density of 1 du/4,8,20 acres (depending on slope), which is typically too high a density for areas with floodplains, steep slopes, or sensitive environmental habitats.
- 8. *Create a Model for Community Development*: Although this plan contains "current urban development areas", it does not address community-based development patterns. In addition, this plan does not support the development of town centers and rural villages in many communities with substantial existing or future populations.

9. *Obtain a Broad Consensus*: Broad based interest groups, and many Community Planning or Sponsor Groups, do not support this plan.

### **GP2020 WORKING COPY MAPS**

- 1. **Develop an Internally Consistent General Plan**: The distribution of residential land use densities in these plans seeks to minimize environmental impacts and apply the proposed planning principles in a consistent manner across the County. GP2020 will be developed and reviewed for consistency with State standards.
- 2. *Meet Growth Targets*: These plans produce population projections that are about 10,600 to 12,500 persons over the target population.<sup>1</sup>
- 3. *Reduce Public Costs*: These plans reduce public costs by reducing population capacity and by relocating growth to areas with existing infrastructure and services. Road construction costs alone are reduced by approximately 70 percent when compared to the Existing General Plan.
- 4. *Improve Housing Affordability*: Affordable building types are primarily found in medium to high densities, and GP2020 increases the capacity for building future dwelling units at those densities from about 23 percent to about 45 percent of all future dwelling units (when compared to the Existing General Plan). These plans also incorporate clustering concepts to help improve housing affordability in low-density areas.
- 5. **Balance Competing Interests**: GP2020 address the competition for land for housing, agriculture and habitat preservation by reducing the amount of large lot residential development capacity in prime agricultural areas, on environmentally sensitive land, and in remote areas and Backcountry communities. These plans decrease development pressures on such areas by favoring more efficient development patterns within rural villages or town centers, and by accommodating residential growth on less land.
- 6. *Locate Growth Near Infrastructure, Services, and Jobs*: GP2020 directs 80 percent of all future growth to areas inside the CWA boundary, which is close to the region's job centers as well as its existing infrastructure and services.
- 7. Assign Densities Based on Characteristics of the Land: Mapping decisions are based on an analysis of physical and environmental constraints such as road access, steep slopes, floodplains, and sensitive environmental habitats. Densities applied in this manner also result in land use maps that more accurately reflect development capacity when infrastructure, physical constraints, and sensitive habitats are taken into account.

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Scenarios within 2 to 3 percent of the County's target population are evaluated as "meeting" this objective. Higher populations were not because additional capacity increases costs for both infrastructure and essential services.

- 8. *Create Model for Community Development*: The GP2020 model provides a central, urbanized core, surrounded by low-density (semi-rural) development and very low-density greenbelts that provide open space and a separation between communities. This model provides a useful blueprint for creating efficient, community-based land use patterns.
- 9. *Obtain A Broad Consensus*: The December 2002 Working Copy map received approval as a work-in-progress from the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission and Interest Group Committee. This map was produced through a long public process that included meetings with advisory groups, Community Planning and Sponsor Groups, and individual landowners. Although the August 2003 Working Copy map is similar, consensus for that map is less established and environmental groups objected to changes to Rural Lands.

## **BOARD REFERRALS SCENARIOS**

Although the primary purpose of the Board Referrals scenarios was to analyze and compare traffic impacts, these scenarios were also evaluated based on how well they do (or do not) meet GP2020 objectives. Because the Board Referrals Scenario map served as a base map for Scenarios 5 through 8, all Board Referrals Scenario maps share common characteristics. Cases where one particular scenario possesses characteristics not shared by the Board Referrals Scenario maps are noted below with an <u>underline</u>.

1. **Develop an Internally Consistent General Plan**. All Board Referrals scenarios contain some residential designations that do not fit the proposed GP2020 planning principles. The inclusion of this small number of exceptions could jeopardize the planning principles used to develop the GP2020 land use maps.

<u>Pipelined Projects</u>: The purpose of the pipeline policy was to assure landowners that project applications deemed complete by August 6, 2003 would be reviewed under existing regulations. Therefore, the inclusion of pipelined projects on GP2020 maps is unnecessary, but if included, could jeopardize the proposed GP2020 planning principles.

The <u>Pre-FCI</u> scenario is also not consistent with State law because it reverses land use designations established by voter initiative.

- 2. **Meet Growth Targets**: All Board Referrals scenarios add unnecessary population capacity, and take the plan away from the County's target population of 660,000<sup>2</sup>. That is particularly true for the Without 80s and 160s and Pre-FCI scenarios, which are approximately 27,000 and 40,000 persons over County targets respectively.
- 3. *Reduce Public Costs*: A variety of public construction and maintenance costs will be higher for the Board Referrals scenarios because they increase large-lot development and

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Endorsed by the Board of Supervisors, April 1998. Following areas not yet endorsed by Board of Supervisors: Borrego: 12,000; Boulevard: 4,134; Jacumba: 5,000; Lake Morena/Campo: 4,640; Potrero: 1,525; Tecate: 1,000; Valle de Oro: 42,720; Valley Center: 45,853; Total = 649,323. *Note: The Community Targets were established before the 2000 Census data was available.* 

development in remote areas. Road construction cost estimates for Board Referrals scenarios are higher than the December 2002 Working Copy map as follows:

Board Referrals: + \$123 million
Board Referrals with Pipelined Projects: + 162 million
Board Referrals without 80s & 160s: + \$339 million
Board Referrals Pre-FCI: + \$608 million

- 4. *Improve Housing Affordability*: None of the Board Referrals scenarios increase the amount of land with medium to high densities, which is associated with affordable building types. Instead, all Board Referrals scenarios increase the amount of large-lot residential development.
- 5. **Balance Competing Interests**: All Board Referrals scenarios increase the amount of large-lot development, which will increase development pressures on land currently used for agriculture, open space and habitat preservation.
- 6. **Locate Growth Near Infrastructure, Services, and Jobs**: Some referrals and pipelined projects are located in remote areas and/or on environmentally sensitive land, which is not consistent with this objective. The Without 80s and 160s and Pre-FCI scenarios add growth in Backcountry communities, which is also not consistent with this objective.
- 7. Assign Densities Based on Characteristics of the Land: Some referrals apply densities that are too high for the underlying physical or environmental constraints. In particular, the <a href="Pre-FCI">Pre-FCI</a> scenario, which applies Semi-Rural densities in the Cleveland National Forest, is not consistent with this objective.
- 8. *Create a Model for Community Development*: The Board Referrals Scenarios include many referred properties that create isolated pockets of development in otherwise rural settings. That is not consistent with the community development model.
- 9. *Obtain Broad Consensus*: Some densities in all the Board Referrals scenarios are not consistent with Planning Commission or Community Planning and Sponsor Group recommendations. They are also inconsistent with the December 2002 Working Copy map, which was supported by the broad-based Interest Group Committee.